

2016-06-27

NISO Open Discovery Initiative Update

Varnum, Kenneth J.

<https://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/122725>

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Downloaded from Deep Blue, University of Michigan's institutional repository



#alctsAC16



NISO Open Discovery Initiative Update

Ken Varnum, University of Michigan Library
@varnum | varnum@umich.edu

June 27, 2016

Co-Sponsors:

LITA – Library Information Technology Association

NISO - National Information Standards Organization



Today's Agenda

- Overview of ODI Working Group
- Recommended Practice
- Shift to Standing Committee
- Why ODI Recommended Practice Matters
- What You Can Do
- Your Questions & Comments

The Context for ODI

- Based on a meeting at ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans on Sunday, June 26, 2011. Recognition of the following trends and issues:
 - Emergence of Library Discovery Services solutions
 - Based on index of a wide range of content
 - Commercial and open access
 - Primary journal literature, ebooks, and more
 - Adopted by thousands of libraries around the world, and impact millions of users
 - Agreements between content providers and discovery providers ad-hoc, not representative of all content, and opaque to customers.

Goals of Working Group (2011-2014)

- Define ways for libraries to assess the level of content providers' participation in discovery services
- Help streamline the process by which content providers work with discovery service vendors
- Define models for “fair” linking from discovery services to publishers' content
- Determine what usage statistics should be collected for libraries and for content providers

What is the ODI Recommended Practice?

- A technical recommendation
- Assessment mechanism
- A model to enhance fair and unbiased indexing and linking

Why Does the ODI Recommended Practice Matter?

- Simplifies the process of data exchange between participating discovery vendors and content providers
- Ensures participating discovery vendors are following fair and unbiased indexing and linking practices
- Mitigates technical and legal issues that might hinder broader participation by content providers or potential discovery service creators

Recommended Practice

- *Open Discovery Initiative: Promoting Transparency in Discovery* (NISO RP-19-2014) - June 26th, 2014
 - Vocabulary
 - NISO Recommended Practice
 - Mechanisms to evaluate conformance with recommended practice

Vocabulary

1.2 Terms and Definitions – Key areas

- Search Models and Related Concepts
- Data Definitions
- Methods of Data Exchange
- Actors
- License Terms

Vocabulary (Examples)

- Central index
- Enhanced metadata
- Syndication
- Content provider
- Market product

Recommended Practices

3.1 General

- **Oversight Group** – education, promotion, ongoing discussion
- **Conformance Disclosure** – via checklists included in the best practice

Recommended Practices

3.2 Content Providers

- **Participation** – provide core metadata and full-text/original content, as well as full text and enriched content
- **Core metadata elements** – basic citation metadata (author, title, publisher, date, type, format, etc)
- **Enriched content** – indexing data (A&I data like subject headings), full text or transcript, abstracts/description
- **Disclosure** – provide information to libraries related to level of participation
- **Technical formats** – use existing standards to facilitate data exchange

Recommended Practices

3.3 Discovery Service Providers

- **Disclosure** – provide key information in a consistent, usable form to libraries about content indexed to facilitate evaluation
- **Linking** – linking and relevancy methods should not introduce bias to particular content providers; libraries should determine linking choices; annual disclosure related to neutrality
- **Data transfer** – use existing protocols and provide documentation, preferences, and indication on impact on different processes to content providers

Recommended Practices

3.4 Usage Statistics

Provide simple and frequent statistics to content providers

- Total number of searches
- Result clicks
- Total number of click-throughs

Provide simple and frequent statistics to libraries

- Total number of searches per month
- Total number of unique visitors per month
- Total number of click-throughs per month
- Top 500 search queries for the last period
- Top 100 referring URLs to the discovery service for the last period

ODI Standing Committee

- Formed summer of 2014.
- Following the [ODI Recommended Practice](#) document as our guide, this standing ODI committee has the following responsibilities:
 - to promote educational opportunities about adoption of these recommended practices
 - to provide support for content providers and discovery providers during adoption (including championship of self-check conformance lists)
 - to provide a forum for ongoing discussion related to all aspects of discovery platforms for all stakeholders (content providers, discovery providers, libraries), and
 - to determine timing for next steps for ongoing work

ODI Standing Committee Roster

Libraries

Marshall Breeding, Independent Consultant
Ken Chad, Ken Chad Consulting, Ltd.
Laura Morse, Harvard University

Jason Price, SCEL
Ken Varnum, University of Michigan

Publishers

Lettie Conrad, SAGE Publications
Susan Hillson, APA
Karen McKeown, Cengage Learning

Elise Sassone, Springer
Julie Zhu, IEEE

Service Providers

Scott Bernier, EBSCO Information Services
Rachel Kessler, Ex Libris

Mike Showalter, OCLC

Conformance Disclosure

Content Provider Conformance Checklist – Appendix B

Y/N/P	Recommendation	Paragraph	Comment
	Content Provider makes available to Discovery Service Providers core metadata and underlying full-text/original content for complete offerings.	3.2.1.1 (1)	
	Content Provider makes available to Discovery Service Providers, the core set of metadata elements (see 3.2.1.2) for each item submitted for indexing.	3.2.1.1 (2)	
	Content Provider provides the content item and additional descriptive content for as much of their content as possible.	3.2.1.1 (3)	
	Content Provider provides libraries, on request, with a statement of participation in the discovery services, including disclosure of coverage depth and content depth.	3.2.2	
	Content Provider's agreements with Discovery Service Providers do not include non-disclosure agreements.	3.2.3	
	The transfer of Content Provider's data to Discovery Service Providers makes use of existing standards where applicable and uses one of the metadata encoding schemes listed in 3.3.3.	3.2.4	

Conformance Disclosure

Discovery Service Conformance Checklist – Appendix C

Y/N/P	Recommendation	Reference	Comment
	Discovery Service provides content listing for library customers	3.3.1	
	Linking	3.3.2	
	Discovery Service does not discriminate among Content Providers contributing to the service.	3.3.2 (1)	
	Mechanisms are offered to enable libraries to establish preferences regarding which platforms to present to users as link targets, and in what order or priority.	3.3.2 (2)	
	Discovery Service confirms with non-bias with regard to content indexed and results presented to the user. A statement in this regard is published annually.	3.3.2 (3)	
	Discovery Service uses an algorithm that is non-preferential with regard to the Content Provider for generating result sets, relevance rankings, and link order.	3.3.2 (4)	
	Link presentation associated with a given result is configurable by libraries.	3.3.2 (5)	

Why Should Libraries Care about ODI?

CONTENT, CONTENT, CONTENT

Discovery system can only be effective if the **depth** and **breadth** of indexed content matches the libraries collections

- If discovery systems do not get timely feeds of rich metadata/full text from content providers, libraries are not able to expose their collections to users.
- **All content providers (including aggregators) need to provide rich quality data to all discovery systems equally!**

Why Should Content Providers/Aggregators Care?

USE, USE, USE

If content is not “findable” via library “front door”, access and use will go down.

- Much use of discovery systems is for known item searching.
- If not included in discovery, serendipitous exposure of materials in native platforms is missed, which may impact development of advanced information seeking skills

Why Should Discovery Service Providers Care about ODI?

- Standard way to deliver metadata to discovery services providers
- Standard for (core) metadata elements included in discovery services content providers

Current Initiatives

- Abstracting & Indexing Service Outreach
- Library Advocacy
- Conformance Statement Support
- Discovery Service Outreach

ODI Initiatives: Library Responsibilities

Q: What can libraries do to ensure that discovery services meet user and institutional needs?

A: A lot!

Q: What can libraries do to ensure that Licensed Content is available discovery systems?

A: A lot!

www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/library_talking_points/

How to Leverage ODI for Your Library

Discovery Providers

- Selecting a discovery service provider
- Configuring your discovery service provider
- Advocating for discovery service provider conformance with ODI

Content Providers

- Advocating for additional content
- Optimizing configuration of each content provider
- Advocating for content provider conformance with ODI

ODI Participation

- Review NISO RP-19-2014, Open Discovery Initiative: Promoting Transparency in Discovery: [NISO RP-19-2014 PDF](#)
- On the web: <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi>
- Help with Conformance Checklist:
<http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/conformance>
- Library Materials:
http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/library_talking_points/
- Twitter: [@NISO ODI](#)
- Via email, subscribe: <http://www.niso.org/lists/opendiscovery/>

Your Questions & Comments

Thank you!

Ken Varnum

varnum@umich.edu

@varnum



Thank you
for attending this ALCTS program

Your feedback is important to us!

Please take a moment to complete a
short online evaluation form at the URL below:

<http://tinyurl.com/alctsac16>

